THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1941. Vol. XXXI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Sir Hugh Walpole's Optimism.

Both Church and country have lost a loyalist by the death of Sir Hugh Walpole. Combined with his wide experience and deep discernment was the rare gift of a judicious optimism. He even dared to regard the present war as a blessing, not a curse. His latest testimony to his convictions is contained in his *Open Letter of an Optimist.*[1] There he wrote :

> 'I believed, and profoundly believed, that Britain would, after this war, be a finer, better place than the Britain before it. I believed—and believe — that this horrible foul war has really saved Britain — that it was necessary for her salvation.'

Nevertheless it was also clear to him that if the war succeeded in saving Britain it might in the end, through Britain, save the world by becoming, what indeed Britain already is in part, the example of a new order neither Nazi nor Bolshevist, and that new order the product, under Providence, of Christian common sense. This Christian common sense he found embodied in the despised British Middle Classes, which he described as 'the salt of the British earth.' Their ideals he summarized as follows :

> 'A commonsense attitude to property — that is, every man must have his privacy, his square of garden, the possibility of educating his children, the right to speak his mind freely, to be free in his religion, his politics, the expression of his opinions generally' (p. 25).

[1] Macmillan War Pamphlets. No. 9. 3*d.* 1941.

He was a believer in socialism of the British brand, the ideal of which is not the easy one of levelling down, but the slow and arduous one of levelling up :

> 'A Britain that is truly a member of a World Federation, truly educated, truly socialist, truly a country governed by the People for the People' (p. 28).

Of religion he wrote in his latest confession :

> 'I would say very little, although it is by far the most important matter of all. It is, indeed, at the root of all the rest. . . . In this war, many activities are at work and they are all active towards a more general spiritual comradeship. . . . All the deep underlying current is sweeping towards a new simplicity and a new generosity of heart. No single one of the countries of the world has yet attempted to put into practice the actual teachings of Jesus Christ. Now it is certain that we are all passing into a new world of difficulty, poverty, material hardship. The religious sects of the world, in India, in Spain and many other countries, have been quarrelling so long and so fiercely that the need for some sort of comradeship that must follow this war may bring about a new realization of Christ's law of love and toleration of our weaknesses one with another. Here in Britain, at least, it is towards that toleration that we seem to be moving' (p. 31).

Towards Christian Unity.

There are many signs of the growth of the spirit of Christian Unity to-day. The Whitsunday service in Westminster Abbey, when the representatives of sixteen foreign countries together with the representatives of the Free Churches of Britain joined with the Church of England clergy and people in united Christian worship, is not the least significant of such signs.

The organization known as 'The Sword of the Spirit,' consisting of English Churchmen, Roman Catholics and Free Churchmen co-operating together to secure 'an agreed Christian order' in national and international affairs, is another such significant movement. The implementing of the ideals of this combination presents many practical difficulties, and we are of opinion that our statesmen are better judges of what is practically realizable in this respect than are our religious leaders. Nevertheless, the willingness of our religious leaders to co-operate to the best of their ability in this movement is deserving of the warmest support. This movement was initiated by Cardinal Hinsley, and it was he who decided to co-opt representatives of the Church of England and of the Free Churches to serve on its executive committee. Of course, 'the Sword of

the Spirit' movement is concerned only with social, economic and political conditions, not with theological and ecclesiastical problems, where the greatest barriers to Christian Unity exist.

At its latest meeting as reported by the *Church Times* of May 16th, the following significant incident deserves to be put on record :

> 'At the beginning of the meeting there had been a moment of uncertainty and embarrassment, when Cardinal Hinsley, having taken the chair, stood and made the sign of the cross, but committed himself to no more than silent prayer. But amends were made at the conclusion, when he said : "It is suggested that we should say together the Lord's Prayer."'

A new species of parish magazine created by the Rev. Gilbert Cope, Vicar of Immanuel Church, Birmingham, is an effort to promote Christian fellowship where it matters most, namely, in the parish. It is a united parish magazine in which the activities and fixtures both for Sundays and week-days of the local Baptist and Methodist Churches are presented side by side with those of the Church of England. It is left at every house in the parish free of charge, and the expense of it is borne by all three denominations in common.

Another example of that Christian fellowship, which is the most promising basis of Christian Unity, is seen in the offer of the Rev. G. H. Salter, Vicar of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn Viaduct, to accommodate the congregations of the City Temple, so deplorably destroyed by German bombers. Mr. Salter, in issuing this invitation to Mr. Weatherhead, minister of the City Temple, placed no restriction and made no conditions whatever with regard to the Free Church services to be held in St. Sepulchre's.

The Liturgical Rights of the Laity.

According to the ideal of the Christian Church it possesses no laity. All its members are priests. Those who minister in the congregation are the representatives of this corporate priesthood. Where these representative priests are not present, and their services cannot be secured, the congregation itself or any member of the same, with the consent of his fellow-members, possesses an inherent right to minister liturgically. For instance, Tertullian (at the beginning of the third century) maintained that three Christian laymen wrecked on a desert island could

celebrate a valid Eucharist.

In the practice of the Church of England there are interesting survivals of the exercise of the priesthood of the laity. For instance, in case of necessity, not only any layman, but any laywoman can baptize. When we recall that Baptism was the great sacrament of the primitive Church this may be rightly construed as empowering any Christian man or woman to perform any sacramental rite in case of necessity. At the recent session of the Convocation of Canterbury it was decided that any lay reader, with the approval of his bishop, may administer the Chalice at Holy Communion. We value this permission, not simply because it will prove to be a great convenience to many parish priests and their congregations, but also because it is a public example in our English Church services of the exercise of the inherent priesthood of the laity. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the Church of England the parish clerks, who of course are not ordained, have long possessed the right to read the Epistle at the Holy Communion. An interesting account of the history and survival of this practice is to be found in the Alcuin Club Tract, *The Parish Clerk, and his right to read the Liturgical Epistle*, by Cuthbert Atchley (1903). In the revised Prayer Book of 1928 the rubric dealing with the reading of the Epistle at the Holy Communion service made it clear that it was not necessary for it to be read by either a priest or a deacon.

B.B.C. Exclusion of the Creed from Evensong.

A correspondent in the *Church Times* of May 30 protests, in the name of 'thousands,' against the exclusion of the Apostles' Creed from Evensong in the B.B.C. services. He is convinced that it is the failure of the Church to teach dogma dogmatically which is the principal cause of the Church's weakness to-day.

> 'We believe the curse of this war lies heavily upon us, because to that mockery, a "creedless Christianity," and to the failure of the Church boldly to teach the dogmas of the Faith, is attributable the paganism into which our nation has fallen.'

The recitation of the Apostles' Creed at the daily services is not going to help the situation. No one will question the vitality and vigour of the Church of the first four centuries, yet the Apostles' Creed was, we believe, never recited liturgically dur-

ing that period except at the service of Baptism. In fact, it is probable that the Christian of those days only once recited liturgically the Apostles' Creed during his whole Christian life on earth, and that was when he was baptized. It is not the frequent public recitation of a creed which is necessarily going to make it either credible or convincing. Dogmatism and the dogmatic manner will prove equally ineffective in a community in which the scientific temper and scientific methods of research are consciously, and even unconsciously, dominating our attitude towards truth in every sphere. It is not the method parodied by Gilbert ('He said it once, he said it twice, he said it three times three') which can avail to-day, and we are glad that the good sense and judicious courage of the B.B.C. recognizes this.

In Gerald Heard's recently published volume *The Creed of Christ*,[2] we find a discussion of the place of the creeds in the Christian religion to-day which supports the policy of the B.B.C. Mr. Gerald Heard recognizes that while the traditional Christian creeds served a useful purpose in the past, they fail to provide men to-day with what they most need in this sphere, and what the Christian religion exists to give—a Way of Life.

> 'The creeds certainly appeared for some considerable time to be winning way. They were terse and definite. . . . As time has gone on, however, the creeds have tended more to separate than to unite. It has become clear that they attempted to condense too much and to define too far. Religion is concerned with life, with a process. Beyond a point, definition becomes limitation. In order to act we need to make certain hypotheses about the universe, but all action will become arrested, all actual advance be frustrated (largely through our energy going in disputes), if the hypotheses, instead of being used as means to gain more knowledge, are accepted as final dogmas to be enforced. . . . The failure of creeds seems then to be that they attempted to handle as ends and entities certain facts which at our present state we can only deal with as means, as functions. Hence, while men have disputed about what they strove to define but could not produce, their disputing, which itself could never bring them either knowledge or agreement, prevented them from undertaking that action, that training, that following-out of instruction in spiritual living and evolution which would have brought them to true understanding and union' (p. 3).

The Christian Church and the Christian man must have a creed, but the dogmatic and historic types of creed having lost their value for modern use, we need new types of creed in which

[2] *The Creed of Christ*: An interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. (Cassells. 6*s*. 1941.)

to affirm our Christian faith. Scholasticism must give place to psychology: historic traditions to working hypotheses: complacent certainties to practical experiment. The earliest Christian creed, 'I believe that Jesus is the Christ,' sufficed for the first generation of disciples. Could the Christian Church have been satisfied with no more than this creed, which confessed Jesus as Lord and Leader, much might have been gained. Students of Church History know how the Church was compelled to enlarge the scope of its teaching, to increase the number of its affirmations, to multiply its definitions. Sincere enquiries, plausible misinterpretations, unjust criticism demanded these expansions of Church doctrine; but the pity is that it was thought necessary to summarize these expansions and to incorporate them into the Christian Creed. We really need in this matter to aim at primitive Christian simplicity and to make our Christian creed to-day as simple and as practical as we can. There is no need to scrap the traditional creeds nor to prevent those using them who wish to use them, but we do need, for evangelistic purposes at least, new creeds for the expression of the eternal Christian faith in the simplest and most practical form attainable, and it is high time that our Church's leaders shewed more practical understanding and sympathy in this matter. This is a primary and pressing duty to-day, and inasmuch as it is an educational necessity, it ought to take precedence before political and economic programmes in Church circles.

The Vanishing Country Parson.

The reform proposals for which the *Men, Money and the Ministry* movement are agitating cover roughly three types of reform. The first is concerned with financial readjustments and equalization of scales of payment. This bulks large and is very doctrinaire. The second is the reorganization and re-grouping of parochial areas. This comes more within the sphere of practical politics but bristles with local difficulties. Here much can and may be done in the post-war period. The third is the strengthening of the ministry by tapping fresh, and in some respects more effective, sources of supply. It is this third sphere of reform which seems to us to be the most important. It is the quality of the clergy which must prove in the long run the de-

termining factor in deciding whether this country is to become Christian or non-Christian. In More's *Utopia* the clergy were few, but men of great personal weight. In More's England the clergy were numerous and uninfluential.

It is the country parishes which at the present time are most concerned with this question of supply and the right kind of supply. Urban and suburban parishes are much more easily provided with what they need. Country parishes need married men of good standing, country-bred, if possible; men possessed of no ecclesiastical ambitions, and who are prepared to remain all their pastoral life in one parish and who find in the pastoral life of that parish and in the society of their rural neighbours adequate environment. Such rural clergymen have to possess interior resources such as it may be supposed really educated and really religious men always have at hand. It was the pagan Cato, the Elder, who said of himself, 'Never less alone than when alone'; and it was the Founder of our religion who said, 'I am not alone for the Father is with me.'

Unfortunately this type of man is not to-day offering himself for service in our country places, and as a consequence town-bred clergymen are being relegated to our country parishes, and prove in many cases to be as unhappy as are their poor parishioners. Yet is it not possible to-day to secure the right kind of parson for the country parish? We believe that it is possible, but to do so demands definite and sustained effort on the part of our Church authorities. The recent ordination of Sir Charles Bentinck, formerly British Ambassador in Chile, whom we observe will be appointed a year hence to the incumbency of a country parish, suggests one method of solving the difficulty. There are many men serving in the I.C.S. and the Colonial services who on retirement between the ages of 40 and 50 would make excellent country parsons if the way were prepared by the bishops for dealing with this source of supply, and providing that they were appointed to their country parish within a year or so of their ordination.

This also applies to many retired naval and military officers. There is here a great body of Christian laymen, well-bred, well-educated, trained in the arts of administration and leadership, who if appointed to country parishes would prove a godsend to

the countryside and strengthen greatly the influence of the Church in rural England. This, however, will not come about by itself. The bishops must show some willingness to secure the services of such men, and provide schemes for their training, ordination and promotion. Were this done successfully, the unpopular forced unions of country parishes, the sale of ancient rectories and vicarages, the general lowering of the status of the country clergy, the removal of the influence, social and domestic, of the country clergyman's family, might all be obviated, as well as the problems of rural clerical poverty.

Another source of supply for country parishes might be found in the educational profession. It is hard to estimate how much the Church in country places has owed to the ministrations of retired Fellows of Oxford and Cambridge Colleges. These men are not available to-day, but there are large numbers of ex-schoolmasters, retired on pension, who would make excellent country clergymen. Cannot the bishops make plans and formulate schemes for dealing with this potential source of supply? The present tendency in clerical circles is to favour the ordination of very young men. There is much to be said for young men as curates, if they are to have a long period of training as such. The laity in country places, however, do not favour the appointment of young men as incumbents. They prefer married men with families who are prepared to settle down and live with them.

Putting our House in Order.

Centralization, Uniformity and Bureaucracy are the watchwords of modern organization. The older English system has favoured local government, infinite variety, and administration as far as possible by honorary amateurs. When the question is put, why substitute the new methods for the old? the reply is invariably made that efficiency and justice demand the change. If it be asked, was the old system really marked by injustice and inefficiency? a very black case is presented against it by the ingenious but too often unscrupulous presentation of exceptions as though they were the rule. If it be enquired, will not the new methods prove in the long run to be much more expensive than the old? it is replied that skilful administration by

experts will most certainly produce an increase of income which will far outweigh the additional expenditure incurred by the new methods, and that public appreciation of the perfection of the new methods will secure greatly increased support for the institutions and departments into which those new methods have been introduced. This general line of argument underlies our latest ecclesiastical stunt known as *Men, Money and the Ministry*.

We do not suppose that the unorganized majority of Churchmen will be able to restrain, or even think it worth while to attempt to restrain, this latest ecclesiastical enthusiasm. In such matters as these the tendency of the Church is to follow the State, and imitate the ways of the political and civic community in which it exists. In the case of the Church, these economic matters are secondary. They do not constitute the primary work of the Church or the purpose for which it was created. 'It is not meet that we should leave the Word of God to serve tables,' said St. Peter in the name of his fellow-apostles to those who complained to him that economic injustice was occurring in the charitable administration of the primitive Church. He bade the complainants, however, to seek out from among you 'men of good report full of the spirit of wisdom whom we may appoint over this business' (*Acts* vi, 3). Seven good laymen were appointed and the economic conflict was terminated.

We believe that the Church of England to-day is no more lacking in such competent laymen than was the Church of Jerusalem, and that they may be found in the ranks of those church corporations whose skilful administration of the Church's finances have done so much, during the last hundred years, to remove injustices and improve efficiency in church finance. We hope, therefore, that the members of our apostolic ministry will assign the task to them as quickly and quietly as possible, and remove the agitation for financial reforms from the footlights and applause of the platform to the quiet and impartial consideration of the council chamber.

As we scan the latest proposals[3] for Church financial reform, a sequel to *Men, Money and the Ministry*, it is clear to us that if carried they would (1) increase greatly the power of the

[3] *Putting our House in Order.* (Longmans. 3*s*. 6*d*. 1941.)

bishops but would not increase the revenues of the Church. (2) They would decrease the status and security of tenure of the parochial clergy, but would not diminish their financial straitness. (3) They would create a great deal of local disturbance, but would not strengthen the influence of the Church in the parishes. We are compelled to add that we feel no moral enthusiasm for a scheme of Church financial reform which proposes to secure the life interests of the present generation of clergy while persuading them to assent to 'reforms' which will touch financially, not themselves, but only their successors. Those who propose to reform others should be willing themselves to be reformed. Much more fundamental reforms are needed in the Church to-day. These reforms are the particular business of the clergy. These reforms lie, not in the sphere of financial re-distribution, but in the sphere of Christian education and Christian unity. We hope that our Church authorities will not be diverted by the seductions of Church finance from solving the pressing problems of Christian education and Christian unity. Let the laity attend to the financial tables, but let the apostolic ministry give itself to the Word of God.

SIR JAMES FRAZER

By J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc., author of *Science and Religion*, etc., etc.

THERE are students whose work, though of the first importance, may be little known to the educated public and exercise only an indirect, if any, influence upon their mentality. But there are some few who, whether from the nature of their studies, or through their possession of singular gifts of exposition, or because of the ripeness of the times, have exercised a direct, powerful and clearly seen influence upon the minds of their contemporaries. Of such have been *savants* like Renan and the late Sir James Frazer. There can be few educated Englishmen or Scotsmen who have not heard of *The Golden Bough*, just as there can be few Frenchmen who have not heard of the *Vie de Jésus* and the sequence of notable works which followed it.

Frazer went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, from Glasgow University in 1874. Five years later he became a Fellow of his College. It was as a classical scholar that he began his career, and his interest in anthropology was originally aroused by reading Tylor's great work, *Primitive Culture*; this interest was further stimulated by the arrival in Cambridge of the distinguished Orientalist, William Robertson Smith, whose studies in the sphere of Semitic religion had proved too much for the elders of his church. Frazer, with pardonable enthusiasm, regarded Robertson Smith as the greatest man he had ever known, his claim to enduring fame proceeding from his application of 'the comparative method' to the study of religions. Sir James Frazer in a biographical sketch of Smith wrote:

> 'The idea of regarding the religions of the world not dogmatically but historically—in other words, not as systems of truth or falsehood to be demonstrated or refuted, but as phenomena of consciousness to be studied like any other aspect of human nature—is one that seems hardly to have suggested itself before the nineteenth century. Now when, laying aside as irrelevant to the purpose in hand the truth or falsehood of religious beliefs, we examine side by side the religions of the different races and ages, we find that, while they differ from each other in many particulars, the resemblances between them are numerous and fundamental, and that they mutually illustrate and explain each other. . . . Thus the comparative study of religion soon forces on us the conclusion that the course of religious evolution has been, up to a certain point, very similar among all men, and that no one religion, at all events in its earlier stages, can be fully understood without a comparison of it with many others.'

As Dr. R. R. Marett in a Press notice of Sir James has pointed out, the modern anthropologist is more concerned to discover differences than similarities. 'But,' he adds, 'in the main they (the anthropologists of the constructive era) undoubtedly were right.' Their method opened up new possibilities of understanding the growth and meaning of beliefs and practices both religious and social (the two in the early stages are one).

It was Robertson Smith who as editor of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* invited Frazer to contribute the articles on Taboo and Totemism for the ninth edition (1888), which were later expanded into the four volumes of *Totemism and Exogamy* (1910). His greatest work, *The Golden Bough*, had appeared in two volumes in 1890, and was expanded into twelve volumes between 1911 and 1915. These two exhaustive studies detailed the rela-

tions of religion with marriage on the one hand and agriculture on the other, *i.e.* with the two primary concerns of the human race, reproduction and food supply. Incidentally *The Golden Bough*, especially the sections entitled 'The Dying God,' 'Attis, Adonis, Osiris,' 'Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild,' and 'The Scapegoat,' shed a new and clear light upon the nature and origin of certain traditional Christian doctrines and practices, *e.g.* the doctrine of the Atonement and the cultus of the Mass. Frazer left it to his readers to draw their own conclusions from the facts he adduced, but there can be little doubt that on the whole his researches acted as a solvent of traditional beliefs. The idea did not occur to everybody that beliefs and practices of such universal currency must be regarded as fundamental in human nature, and therefore to be respected on that account if on no other.

It is noteworthy that Frazer's classical studies were also in line with his anthropological interests. Probably his greatest contribution to this branch of study was his six-volume edition and translation of Pausanias (1898), the fruit of nine years of study. Pausanias' *Description of Greece* is the work of a traveller in the second century A.D. whose interests were mainly antiquarian and religious. As the editor says,

> 'Though he professes to describe the whole of Greece, or, more literally, all things Greek, what he does describe is little more than the antiquities of the country and the religious traditions and ritual of the people.'

Next in importance to this work was Frazer's edition of Ovid's *Fasti* (1929), a poetical treatise on the Roman calendar, in which historical events, astronomical phenomena, and religious observances are recorded. Under the editor's hands the material grew to such proportions that it ultimately appeared in nine large volumes.[1]

Frazer's connection with Robertson Smith would naturally attract him to the study of Semitic religion, and his interest in it would be increased by the familiarity with the Old Testament which a traditional Scottish upbringing had bestowed. Thus after the completion of the twelve volumes of *The Golden Bough*, this Semitic sphere drew him, and the result was *Folk*

[1] In 1931 Frazer's text and translation of the *Fasti* appeared in the Loeb Library.

Lore in the Old Testament, of which the three volumes appeared in 1918. This work, a monument of erudition, displays remarkable gifts of delineating character, and also a certain sub-acid humour. A one-volume edition was published in 1923, and was a highly entertaining work.

Another well-known work of Frazer's, *The Belief in Immortality* (Vol. I appeared in 1913, Vol. II in 1922, Vol. III in 1924), examines this belief as existing among the primitive peoples of Australia, New Guinea, Melaneasia, Polynesia, and so on; but the reader will search in vain in these pages for any guidance as to the validity of the belief, to pronounce on which the author declared to be beyond him. And after all it is not the scientist's or historian's business to provide edification or to indulge in metaphysical speculation.

Few men can have left a deeper mark upon the thought of their time than Sir James Frazer; his influence is comparable to that of Charles Darwin yesterday or of Dr. Freud to-day. Some of his stimulating generalizations, like those of the other pair, may have to be revised as fresh facts come to light. But when once a step has been taken forward, such as those taken by Copernicus, by Dalton, by Lyell, or those just mentioned, it can never be retraced — short of a complete collapse of civilization. As Samuel Butler remarked, it is hard to learn, but it is still harder to unlearn. We may not always be the better for what we learn, but that cannot be helped. We have to accept facts and not resist them.

The recent death of Sir James Frazer will give to Mr. Angus Downie's survey of his career and achievements,[2] published last year, an added interest. During Sir James' later years of failing eyesight Mr. Downie was able to be of assistance to him and was in almost daily contact with him. Previous to this Mr. Downie had been a devoted student of the great anthropologist's work, and so is well qualified to write on the scholar whose death we lament. His biography of this great scholar, without being fulsome or adulatory, enables its reader to realize that one of the age of giants has gone from us, leaving our race of pygmies the poorer for his going.

[2] *James George Frazer.* By R. Angus Downie. (Watts & Co. 5*s*. 1940.)

THE ASCENSION: HISTORY OR LEGEND?

By the Rev. J. H. S. Burton, M.A.

THE two accounts of the Ascension, both of which are found within the Lucan writings, are closely connected with the nature of the Resurrection Appearances. Dean Inge has written:

> 'The bodily resurrection of Christ, and His return on the clouds, necessitated a belief in His bodily ascension into heaven. St. Paul mentions the ascension (Harnack is wrong in saying that he does not); but it is not mentioned by Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius or Polycarp. According to *St. Luke* (xxiv, 51) and Barnabas,[1] the ascension took place on the day of the resurrection; and *John* xx, 17 can hardly be interpreted in any other way. The post-resurrection appearances were therefore post-ascension appearances' (*The Modern Churchman*, Vol. XXIX, p. 268).

The Ascension, except for *John* xx, 17 and *Mark* xvi, 19,[2] is peculiar to the Lucan and Pauline traditions in the New Testament, and as J. Weiss shows in *Das Urchristentum*, p. 61, Resurrection means for Paul 'glorification,' or 'exaltation to the presence of God.' As Professor Guignebert says,[3]

> 'The Jesus *seen* by Paul in the conditions described is the *glorified* Lord, unfettered by the bonds of the flesh. There is no need to speak of the *Ascension* here; Jesus is risen because he is glorified; the two processes blend in some way. It is only the materialisation of the glorified body which would make Ascension necessary, and with Paul we are still far from a realistic conception of the Resurrection. It is because he has seen the exalted Christ that he believes in His Resurrection "according to the Scriptures."'

The Ascension represents the climax of the legendary growth of stories springing from the spiritual experience of the presence of the Risen Lord. Three stages of development have taken place:

(*a*) The disciples' consciousness of the presence of Jesus with them after death.

[1] *Epistle of Barnabas* (first quarter of second century) xv, 9: 'That is why we celebrate with joy the third day on which Jesus rose from the dead and on which, after showing himself, he ascended into heaven.'

[2] The longer ending, written probably in the first half of the second century, and certainly no part of the original gospel of Mark.

[3] *Jesus, pp.* 525, 526. Italics his.

(*b*) The attempt to teach this truth in later years by means of stories of (i) the materialized and objective, rather than the spiritual and subjective, presence of Jesus with His followers, and (ii) stories of the empty tomb which are the natural corollaries of (i).

(*c*) The story of the Ascension of the risen body of Jesus, which story was necessitated by the catechumens' question as to the present whereabouts of the risen body of Jesus.

What then is the fact behind the stories of the Ascension and what is the legendary portion of the stories as we now possess them?

It seems fairly clear that the original resurrection experience of the disciples was that of the presence of the risen and glorified Lord. 'The Lord of Glory' (*1 Cor.* ii, 8) is with them as they preach; and Jesus, the crucified prophet, has been exalted as the Christ. But, as various stories arise emphasizing the corporeal resurrection of the Christ, it becomes necessary to explain the final removal of this materialized appearance, or risen body, from the earthly to the heavenly sphere.

It is thus only natural that the first record of the Ascension is merely the briefest possible statement that the risen presence was removed from the apostolic circle; 'and it came to pass while he blessed them, he parted from them' (*Luke* xxiv, 51). The rest of the verse, 'and was carried up into heaven,' is not found in the great Western manuscript (*Codex Bezae*), and is generally acknowledged as a later interpolation, as also is the phrase in the next verse 'they worshipped him.'

It appears that in its earliest form the Ascension is merely the record of the removal of the presence of the risen Christ from the apostolic circle prior to its replacement by the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, which was to be with the Church from Pentecost to all eternity. Originally a simple separation is implied, 'He was parted from them.' Then the question arose, 'Whither did He go?' and the inevitable answer, 'He was carried up into heaven,' is added. So far the whole story is a simple statement of fact, and the phrase 'He was carried up into heaven' does not necessarily imply anything more than the removal of the spiritual presence to a spiritual sphere. It is an amplification of 'He was parted from them.'

But the growth of legend soon began, and Luke, in his second volume for Theophilus, gives indications of this. The questions arose (i) 'How was He borne up into heaven?' and (ii) 'Where is heaven?' The popular mythology supplied the answer to both these questions: (i) by two angels, and (ii) heaven was situated above the firmament in which the sun, moon and stars ran their appointed courses.

Furthermore, when the more simple-minded primitive Christians had come to interpret the Ascension as the removal of a resuscitated physical body, the time factor entered into the argument, and the question was asked 'How long was the resuscitated body present on earth after the resurrection?' The answer given was forty days. It seems probable that this number was derived from Old Testament oracles such as *Exodus* xxiv, 18; xxxiv, 28; *Deuteronomy* ix, 9-11; *I Kings* xix, 8. It was within this period of forty days that the resurrection appearances are usually assumed as taking place. But according to *Luke* xxiv, 51; *Barnabas* xv, 9; and *John* xx, 17 the Ascension took place on the day of the resurrection. But *Luke* xxiv, 51 (minus the Western non-interpolation 'and was carried up into heaven') may be no more than the conclusion of an interview of the risen Lord with His disciples. No destination is named.

The *Epistle of Barnabas* (xv, 9) is much more definite when it says, 'That is why we celebrate with joy the third day on which Jesus rose from the dead and on which, after showing himself, he ascended into heaven.' Unless we refer these two events, the Resurrection and the Ascension, to the same Sunday it is difficult to suppose that the author of *Barnabas* means his readers to understand that Jesus rose on one Sunday and ascended on another Sunday, for the Christian world has accepted the account of forty days intervening between the resurrection and the Ascension, and therefore always celebrates the feast of the Ascension on a Thursday, exactly forty days after Easter, and not on any Sunday. Furthermore, if the Lucan authorship of the Third Gospel and the *Acts of the Apostles* is, as we believe, sufficiently well established, it is difficult to think that so careful an author would have introduced at the beginning of his second volume a passage which directly contradicts the final verses of his first volume. It certainly appears as if the Western non-interpolations have been inserted into *Luke* xxiv,

51, 52 in order to harmonize those verses with the forty days tradition in the opening verses of the *Acts of the Apostles*, and probably they did not appear in Proto-Luke but only in the final edition of the Third Gospel. The manuscript evidence for their inclusion in the text is weak.

John xx, 17, in which Jesus is reported as saying to Mary Magdalene 'Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended unto the Father: but go unto my brethren and say unto them I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God,' raises many problems. For it is a direct contradiction of 'he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him' (*Mark* xvi, 7; *Matthew* xxviii, 7). The simple and direct use of the present tense 'I ascend' in *John* xx, 17 precludes any supposition that the Ascension is a future event, and the Fourth Gospel (with the exception of the Epilogue in chapter xxi) appears either to know nothing of the forty days tradition or else to be written with the deliberate intention of correcting it. Critical opinion is generally agreed that the Fourth Gospel is later than the Synoptic Gospels, the Pauline epistles, and the *Acts of the Apostles*, and that it definitely corrects the false impression given by the Synoptic writers that the Last Supper was a Passover meal.

The question arises, if it be true that the Ascension took place on Easter Day, and Dean Inge is right in saying that the post-Resurrection appearances are post-Ascension appearances (a view supported by the fact that Paul draws no difference between the nature of the late appearance to him and the earlier appearances to the apostles and disciples), how are we to account for the rise of the forty days tradition of *Acts* i, 3-11?

The question is answered by the spiritual experience of the early Church revealed within our records. The New Testament is a clear witness to the fact that, after the death of Jesus, the apostles and disciples were not alone. They passed through two definite phases of religious experience. The first was marked by a constant realization of the spiritual presence of the risen Lord; and the second was marked by the consciousness of the driving power of the Holy Spirit which was vouchsafed to them when, after the lapse of time, their apprehension of the presence of the Christ grew dim.

The Markan reference to the Ascension can be at once

dismissed as of secondary importance, since it only appears in the summary of post-resurrection events added to the Marcan gospel at a later date and not included in the two oldest Greek Codices, *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*. It only remains to consider in detail the story of the Ascension in the *Acts of the Apostles*.

If, as we believe, the *Acts of the Apostles* is by the author of the Third Gospel, it is difficult to suppose that the Ascension story of *Acts* was known to Luke when he wrote his gospel. It must be presumed that this story is a piece of tradition which came to him after he had completed his first volume for Theophilus. Nor is there any reason for supposing that it represents a primitive or authentic tradition. For if, as the story clearly states, the apostolic circle witnessed the Ascension, why is it that there is no mention of it in any of the New Testament writers who claim apostolic authority except for the Fourth Gospel, one of the latest parts of the Bible?[4] Except for *John* xx, 17, the whole scriptural authority for the Ascension is sub-apostolic, and yet it is claimed in *Acts* i that the Apostles witnessed the event. The command in *Acts* i, 8 'to witness unto the uttermost part of the earth' represents a conviction which the apostolic Church only reached after a long period of mental anguish, as is clear from Peter's hesitation to baptize the Gentile Cornelius (*cf. Acts* x, especially verses 28, 34, 35). From the conduct of the early apostolic Church, prior to the Council of Jerusalem in 49 A.D., we can be certain that Jesus never gave any command either to witness 'unto the uttermost part of the earth' or to 'make disciples of all the nations.' These considerations provide strong evidence that Luke's account of the Ascension is of much later date than the New Testament testimony to the Resurrection.

Given the experience of the spiritual presence of the risen Lord, that experience is dramatized and the body clothed in garments of corporeality. The essential requirement of accounting for the absence of the risen body from among the apostles at Pentecost, when they began their preaching in Jerusalem, gave rise to the unconvincing narrative of the Ascension. As Gardner-Smith writes:

[4] *Eph.* iv, 8 is merely a quotation of *Psalm* lxviii, 18 with reference to triumphant deity.

> 'There is no question of bad faith. . . . Legends do not only grow among dishonest people, they grow in all ages, in all countries, among all classes. Naturally their genesis is more rapid among the uneducated and the uncritical, and yet how quickly stories gather round some well-known figure even in the rarefied atmosphere of a university town' (*Narratives of the Resurrection*, p. 80).

It may be added that, necessity being the mother of invention, where the apologetic need is urgent the appearance of the story which will meet that need is almost automatic. In the early Church it was essential to convince the catechumen and the casual listener that the Christ was risen. The mere avowal of the preacher's spiritual experience of the risen Christ was found to be inadequate. The resurrection was of necessity materialized, and this presented the Christian community with the inevitable task of suitably disposing of the risen body of the Christ.

Lastly, it must be noted that the story of the mode of Jesus' Ascension is in keeping with the traditional Jewish method of disposing of the corporeal integuments of their most celebrated religious leaders. 'Enoch walked with God and God took him' (*Gen.* v, 22); Moses went up to the top of Pisgah and God buried him, 'but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day' (*cf. Deut.* xxxiv, 1-6); and Elijah was taken up in a fiery chariot (*II Kings* ii, 11). The translation of the risen Jesus is yet more glorious, for two angels come to fetch Him and He rises up without the aid of fiery chariot or whirlwind. For has He not transcended Moses and Elijah, the symbolic heads of Law and Prophecy?[5]

In the Fourth Gospel, however, the Ascension has become a purely spiritual and invisible occurrence. The crude materialism of the narrative of *Acts* is completely absent. As Professor Lightfoot writes,[6]

> 'The extreme reserve with which St. John treats the doctrine of the Lord's ascension should be noticed; it is not described any more than the "descent" of the Son of God is described at the outset of the record. And in neither case is there any thought in St. John of a movement in space.'

For the author of the Fourth Gospel the Ascension is the secret mystery of the consummation of the communion of Jesus with the Father whereby He endowed the early Church with the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.

[5] *cf.* the Transfiguration.
[6] *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*, p. 99, footnote.

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN AMERICAN EDUCATION *

By Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University.

AT this hour in the history of the world this simple and dignified ceremonial is full of encouragement. Here we are facing the future in terms of the best which the past has to offer. We are doing it in the broadest possible spirit of human sympathy and human understanding, and we are doing it in terms of faith which is adjoined to knowledge.

When Earl Hall was given to Columbia forty years ago, it was given in terms which I like to call catholic, using that word without a capital. Mr. Dodge, himself a devout and devoted member of the Presbyterian Church, provided in his deed of gift for the use of this building by organizations of Roman Catholic students or of Hebrew students as well as of Protestant students. They were all invited on equal terms to friendly and generous co-operation toward one and the same high religious aim.

In this day and generation we are beginning to forget the place which religious instruction must occupy in education if that education is to be truly sound and liberal. We seem to forget that until some two hundred years ago religious instruction everywhere dominated education; religion guided education, shaped education and selected the material for education in every part of the world — in the Orient, in Europe and in the Americas. Then began, as a result of the rise of Protestantism and the spread of democracy, those sharp differences of religious opinion and of religious worship which unfortunately exhibited themselves in highly controversial form. One consequence was to lead men to turn aside from religious study and religious teaching in the attempt to avoid those unfortunate contentious differences which had become so common. Then, particularly in this democracy of ours, a curious tendency grew up to exclude

* An address delivered at the Re-dedication of Earl Hall, New York, November 28, 1940.

religious teaching altogether from education on the ground that such teaching was in conflict with our fundamental doctrine as to the separation of Church and State. In other words, religious teaching was narrowed down to something which might be called denominationalism, and therefore because of differences of faith and practice it must be excluded from education. The result was to give paganism new importance and new influence.

In my own school days the morning exercises in the public schools of my home town in New Jersey opened with the Lord's Prayer repeated by the entire company of pupils and followed by the reading of a chapter of the Bible. There was then sung a hymn from the school hymn book, after which the children went to their several classrooms. That was brought to an end by the decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin written in 1890, holding that this practice was unconstitutional because it permitted an intermingling of Church and State in public schools supported by taxation. In handing down that opinion the Court took pains to emphasize the importance of religious instruction and pointed out that it was the duty of the family and the Church to give it. It is because the family and the Church have not risen to their responsibilities during this past half-century, that religious instruction has so largely passed out of education and that religious knowledge is so largely lacking among the youth of yesterday and to-day.

It must be remembered that, after all is said and done, our country is a religious country. Every day when the Senate of the United States meets, every day when the House of Representatives convenes, the business of the day is opened with a prayer offered by the Chaplain, in the one case of the Senate and in the other case of the House of Representatives. This Chaplain is a Christian minister. The same is true of both houses of the Legislature of the State of New York and of many other state legislatures. In other words, separation of Church and State does not mean that we are a pagan people. It simply means that being a religious and a Christian people as well, we must also be catholic, again using that word with a small 'c.'

The Legislature of the State of New York has only just now passed a statute restoring the American system in the State of New York by providing that at a certain time each week all

pupils in a public school shall be set free to receive such religious instruction as their parents may prefer from teachers of that form of religious faith which their parents choose. This statute realizes that the United States is not pagan but that it is a religious people and must have freedom of religious teaching and of religious faith. This particular system was first introduced in France when, after the political and social revolution which followed the war of 1870-71, the French Parliament in 1882 overturned the school system as then organized. In its new legislation it provided that the public school pupils should be set free on each Thursday and allowed to go to the church or religious institution or the teacher which their parents might select, for religious instruction. Of course, if their parents preferred paganism, that day would be for their children a holiday; otherwise, the children would receive religious instruction in the form which their parents desired.

It is just a little more than forty years ago that I presented my views on this subject before the Sunday School Commission of the Diocese of New York, my subject being 'Religious Instruction and its Relation to Education.' For the first time in years, I looked over that address to-day, it being printed in my volume, *The Meaning of Education.*[1] I do not find one single word in the argument which I then advanced that I would change to-day. Conditions as they then presented themselves have become even more serious, and the solution of the problem which I offered at that time is to me even more obvious to-day than it was then. The fundamental thing to remember is that education is the joint product of the influence of the family, the Church and the school. The school has but a very limited and a very definite function to perform. The family and the Church have very considerable functions to perform which, unhappily, they are increasingly neglecting. Until the family and the Church can be roused to the full height of their responsibility we cannot expect to find the youth of the land in possession of that religious knowledge and religious feeling which were characteristic of their ancestors two or three generations ago.

[1] Nicholas Murray Butler, *The Meaning of Education*, revised edition. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915; pp. 179-200.)

There is also a very curious lack in our course of college study, of which I have spoken during past years. I have never known a course of instruction to be offered to undergraduates on the 'Influence of Faith in Shaping Western Civilization.' All our instruction is based on the influence of knowledge — literature, science, the arts, politics. As a matter of fact, knowledge as opposed to faith had practically no influence in shaping Western civilization until four or five hundred years ago. For some three thousand years civilization was shaped by faith in one of its many forms — Hindu, Brahmin, Hebrew, Christian or Mohammedan. It was that faith which guided men in their ambitions and in their social and political policies. It is only three or four hundred years since knowledge began to displace faith as a controlling influence, and we are mistaken when we look at past history if we put the emphasis upon knowledge from the beginning of recorded time. This would be a very inspiring course of instruction were it to be given by some scholar well schooled in the history of religious faith, familiar with the various religions and with some insight into the personalities which were guiding forces from century to century in Europe's civilization. The youth of to-morrow would then begin to realize that the foundations of that we are now doing were not originally laid by knowledge at all, but by some form of that faith to which all knowledge was subordinate until the beginning of the intellectual revolution which coincided with the beginning of our modern scientific age.

In respect to all this the history of our religious life and work at Columbia shows it to have been of the most admirable and satisfactory sort. When the first charter of King's College was granted in 1754, among the Board of Governors were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the rector of Trinity Church, the senior minister of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church (the oldest in Manhattan), the minister of the ancient Lutheran Church, the minister of the French Church and the minister of the Presbyterian Congregation, these being all the churches that were then on Manhattan Island. That charter provided, at a time when religious tension and religious feeling ran very high, that the Trustees of this newly founded college should never be em-

powered to make any discrimination against teacher or student on account of his religious faith or his religious relationship. So far as I know, this and the very similar provision which was put into the first charter of the College of New Jersey — now Princeton University — founded eight years earlier than King's College, now Columbia University, are the first charter provisions of their kind. Columbia has remained true to that tradition. So it welcomes and has welcomed students and teachers of every form of religious faith when they are honest, sincere, high-minded, genuine. We wish to avoid these unnecessary and bitter theological controversies. We look not only with dismay, but with more than that, upon the violent anti-Semitic movements which find expression from time to time among the American people and which now have been taken up in so cruel a form by despotic governments in various parts of the world. We look with dismay at those passionate expressions of ignorance which are called the Ku Klux Klan and their attack upon members and priests of the Roman Catholic Church. Both anti-Semitism and the Ku Klux Klan are an insult to democracy and a contradiction of it.

But faith—honest, sincere, hopeful—opens a door to moving forward in this new and very difficult world in which our children must live. It opens the door into that world in a spirit inspired by something more than the merely human, the gain-seeking and the temporary. It brings us, our children and our grandchildren, in touch with the eternal verities which are the only possible foundation for a civilization and a life that are worthy of human ambition and human endeavour.

FREEDOM, TRUTH AND LITURGY*

By the Rev. H. P. Kingdon, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Exeter College, Oxford.

'The truth shall make you free'—(St. John viii, 32).

THE word freedom figures very largely in the propaganda of politicians and preachers of the most diverse kinds. I suppose that is largely because freedom is a vague and negative term and suggests to each uncritical listener that the speaker is anxious to remedy his *own* particular grievances and discontents. Freedom readily suggests the absence of what each one finds most irksome. Thus the chief freedom which the Nazis promise to Europe at the moment is from the interference of foreign financiers, of 'pluto-democratic' economic imperialism: while Britain promises especially the removal of the tyranny of the secret police and the concentration camp. But we in England are just vaguely told that our freedom is in peril and we must defend it with all our might.

It would be difficult to deny this statement. But there are many kinds of freedom, some of them good, and some of them bad: and one would have thought it desirable that British citizens should be given more guidance by their Government as to which forms of freedom are considered vital, and which are not. And if the Government decides that it must keep silence, there is the greater need and opportunity for representative Church leaders to speak out. For besides freedom from bad faith, injustice, oppression, and persecution (mentioned as our aim by Mr. Neville Chamberlain at the outbreak of war), there is freedom from unemployment or poverty, freedom from hypocrisy, and freedom from the self-slavery of various bad habits—a very important form of freedom which sometimes seems to be more highly prized in the dictator-countries than in the democracies—these other forms of freedom have also to be taken into account. And even in the sole case of freedom from

*A sermon preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday, May 11th, 1941.

external interference, there is freedom of conscience (both moral, religious, and political), freedom of thought, freedom of speech and other forms of publication, and freedom of action (*e.g.* freedom to strike or to lock-out) to be considered. And of all the different *kinds* of freedom there are also different *degrees*, and of many kinds of freedom it is possible to have too much as well as too little. In fact, the term 'Freedom' is a coat of many colours, which is often mass-produced with all the facility of modern industrial technique, to cover up the consciousness of our nakedness and hide our shame. We must take care lest the colours be painted too bright, and be too varied and inharmonious, until we bring upon us the envy and mistrust of our brethren, and find ourselves, like Joseph, at the bottom of a well and then prisoners in a strange land.

Perhaps the most important distinction to make in connection with freedom, but one which is often overlooked, is that between freedom from *external constraint* and freedom from the tyranny of *one's own bad habits* (whether they are due to heredity or environment or individual choice). And in some ways freedom from this *internal self-slavery* is more important than freedom from external compulsion. A coat, however bright and varied the colours, will be useless unless it has a good lining to hold it together. And although the lining may be concealed from view, it is more important to the wearer than the outside of the coat. An even closer metaphor would be to say that one must have a good heart circulating the blood-stream for the best of coats to keep one warm.

The dangers of this internal self-slavery are well brought out in Plato's *Republic*,[1] in the sketch of the 'democratic' man who consorts with lotus-eaters who 'describe Insolence as good breeding, and Disorder as freedom, and Licentiousness as magnificence, and Shamelessness as bravery,' until he becomes as 'a drone,' burdened by expensive pleasures and desires and governed by unnecessary appetites. And Plato points out that such a man does not merely remain thus 'democratic,' but becomes 'despotic.' For 'excessive freedom is unlikely to pass into anything but excessive slavery, in the case of states as well as of individuals.'[2]

[1] § 560-561. [2] § 564.

Nor is it clearly with this *internal* freedom that my text is chiefly concerned, as the context makes clear. For when the Jews answer that they are Abraham's seed and were never in bondage to any man, and it is therefore nonsense for our Lord to tell them they shall be *made* free, Jesus answers that 'Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin'; and He contrasts the *real freedom* which the Son, who endureth for ever, will bring.

We have already mentioned that the importance of this internal freedom is more keenly realized (along with that of freedom from poverty) is some of the dictator-countries than in some of the democracies. The Nazis sometimes define *Freheit* as *Zufriedenheit in Dienst*, 'contentment in service.' And indeed there is nothing like devotion to a cause far bigger than one's own individual interests to free one from the laziness, egoism, and ignorance which chiefly produce self-slavery. The relative success of Nazism is a striking proof of this. But the success of Nazism will prove to be as limited as are its aims. For the fact that it is merely nationalistic and naturalistic, and virtually ignores the God who transcends both nation and man, is bound (1) to involve it in conflict with other nations, leading to the most violent deprivations of both external and internal freedom — to disease and death, as well as lust and panic; and (2) to cut it off from sharing in the dynamic opportunities for moral advance which come only from what is far better than man and the morality even of the best form of humanism — namely, God. That of course is why nothing short of utter devotion to God Himself (such as has only once been seen fully-developed upon this earth) can produce *perfect* freedom.

Nor was St. Augustine the first to realise that the only perfect freedom was the service of God: it is implicit all through the Gospels and Epistles, and may be regarded as the very heart of the Christian message. 'With freedom,' says St. Paul, rubbing it well in, as it were, to his readers, 'hath Christ set us free.'[3] But more often the rather negative term 'freedom' is replaced in the New Testament by the more positive terms 'blessedness' and 'eternal life' — less vague, but yet more inclusive of what is truly desirable. No one could maintain that the blessed or those eternally alive are not free: and yet the

[3] *Galatians* v, 1.

secret of their blessedness is that they serve God, that they hunger and thirst after righteousness, that they are merciful and pure in heart, and are persecuted, not for their own shortcomings (which is partly true of the victims of most persecution), but for righteousness' sake.

Further, this perfect freedom demands a large element of deliberate self-sacrifice — the taking up of one's cross. St. Paul died daily for Christ to live in Him; so only was he free from all the frustrations and inhibitions connected with his own vain hopes that it was possible for a mere man to keep every jot and tittle of the Pharisaic Law. But we must not exaggerate the note of self-denial that is essential to the liberty of the Christian life. An extreme asceticism, like that of primitive Buddhism, or of a Simeon Stylites standing on his pillar for years until he could proudly watch the worms drop off, is only another form of internal slavery, involving the tyranny of spiritual pride. We may contrast the Parable of the Talents and of the Sower, which enjoin a high degree of positive growth and self-realization. The word 'blessed' connotes a deep and lasting happiness, and the early Christians were characterized by a strange and unearthly joy. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you that ye shall weep and lament but the world shall rejoice: ye shall be sorrowful but your sorrow shall be turned into joy'—joy like a mother's after the pangs of child-birth, when she rejoices 'that a man has been born into the world' (*Jn.* xvi, 20). This somewhat paradoxical Christian joy has been well expressed in Swinburne's *Super Flumina Babylonis*:

'Whoso takes the world's life on him, and his own lays down,
He, dying so, lives.
Whoso bears the whole heaviness of the wrong'd world's weight
And puts it by,
It is well with him suffering, though he face man's fate;
How should he die?
Seeing death hath no part in him any more, no power
Upon his head;
He has bought eternity with a little hour,
And is not dead.'

But there is another vital element in the making of that perfect freedom. It is not enough to wish to serve God — for you have no guarantee that it is the true God (or, more precisely, the fullest extent of God's self-revelation to mankind) that you seek

to serve. No, it is not mere faith and hope and charity: it is also the *truth* that shall make you free. What did St. John mean by 'truth'? It would be impossible to exhaust his meaning in the course of a mere sermon. But clearly 'Truth' in the Fourth Gospel (where it occurs twenty-five times) has a moral as well as a purely intellectual flavour, and is akin to faith. It is very closely connected with the promised coming of the Holy Spirit, 'the other comforter who shall guide men into all truth,' and with the coming of Christ himself; the Logos, for instance, is 'full of grace and truth.' In one famous passage Christ *is* the truth, as well as the way and the life: more often, He witnesses to or speaks the truth (in contrast to the devil, viii.44), and everyone who is of the truth heareth His voice. In fact, the word is practically equivalent to the Gospel itself, to the revelation of God which came with Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit—'the Spirit of Truth.' But no very clear hint is given as to exactly *how* we may discern the truth when we are in doubt. When Pilate asks his famous question, no answer is recorded: and we must perforce ask the same question still.

The nearest the New Testament comes to giving us any test of truth seems to be *I Jn.* iii, 19, where we are told that we may be sure we belong to the truth and reassure ourselves whenever our heart condemns us (for God is greater than our heart) *if* we put our love not into words or into talk but *into deeds*. This is akin to the Synoptic maxim 'by their fruits ye shall know them,' and lends colour to the contention of certain Roman Catholic 'Modernists' who say (as against the Traditionalists who maintain that because the Bible or the Church says so some proposition must be true) that pragmatism must be the test of religious truth. It *is* surely a mark of Christian faith to believe that what is true will work well in practice: and that is certainly so of the results of, for example, medical research. But it is surely very dangerous to use our human judgement of what works well in practice as a criterion of truth. The fact that some poisonous gas or explosive or bacteria cause frightful suffering (with its ensuing hatred and malice) does not mean that the calculations of the scientist who discovered or isolated that gas or explosive or those bacteria failed to find the truth: on the contrary, in these cases the better his calculations (which must surely be

judged by their coherence with other scientific truth) the more diabolical the result. By the frightfulness of his fruits shall *his* scientific ability be known. These scientists may be sure that they belong to the truth if they put not their love but their hate, not into words or talk, but into deeds. At the human level, what is true intellectually may turn out to be morally most evil — at least in most situations (for we can, most of us, imagine occasions where the use of poison gas or explosives is morally justified as the lesser evil).

But we must not press the analogy from our knowledge of the physical world too closely. For our knowledge of God is entirely knowledge (so far as we have it) of what is *good*: so the deeper that knowledge, there, surely, the better will be the practical results. But even in religion we cannot use our *human* judgement of the goodness or badness of an action as an infallible test of the truth or falsity of a proposition about God.

Surely religious truth also must be tested to *some* extent by intellectual standards (such as coherence or non-contradiction) which are applicable in the quest for scientific or philosophic truth. It will not do to say that religion is concerned with revelation, which is outside the sphere of reason and not to be tested by the normal canons of truth; because it takes two to make a revelation, the revealer and the recipient, whose outlook is bound to colour the revelation as he receives it (just as the music each listener hears is governed partly by the extent and quality of his appreciation), and because there must be elements of reason in any revelation made to *homo sapiens*. St. Thomas Aquinas was surely false to his own excellent principles when he distinguished so sharply between truths of reason and revelation.

In particular, in the case of Christianity, which is to be distinguished from the other great religions by its claims to *historicity* — by its claim to be a revelation of God in history which we can use as an enduring standard whereby to 'discern the spirits' of those who claim to be prophets — here surely the highest and most searching criteria of historical truth must be used unflinchingly to test the traditions of the Church. That, at any rate, has happened in academic circles, especially during the past fifty years. Inevitably there has been much irresponsible theorizing, much disagreement. But the total number of diver-

gent theories which are still put forward by reputable scholars is considerably smaller than the number of those disproved and discarded. And although in the case of many questions the evidence is inconclusive, giving scope for the bizarre dogmatisms of cranks and academic mountebanks (both sceptical and traditionalist), at least scholars know *which* those undecided questions are. And where we *can* be certain, our certainty has all the authority of modern scholarship behind it. Further, there is increasing agreement among recognized authorities on questions of Church History and Biblical Scholarship.

The chief deficiency in the presentation of Christianity to-day is that scholars have not come out of their libraries and studies enough to devote their attention to the reconstruction of popular religious forms and instruction. Although religious education has made great progress, and promises to make even more in the next few years, both in Sunday and in week-day schools, far too little attention has been paid to the improvement of our forms of public worship. Where revisions have been made they have usually been badly done. In the 1928 Prayer-book, for instance, there are many infelicities of phrase and thought, far too little derived from the best literary and scholarly authorities, far too much hack-work from the episcopal bench. Its rejection by Parliament, however much we may deplore the way in which secular authority seemed to override spiritual, will prove a blessing in disguise if it leads to a more successful revision of the Prayer-book in the near future. (Meanwhile, many useful experiments can be tried out during the present interim period, when no one seems to know what constitutes the lawful authority which we clergy have sworn to obey in liturgical questions.)

Pray God this problem may not long be shelved. For at present we still use a *Lectionary* which apparently expects the most simple yokels in parish pews to understand passages in the Bible which have defied the efforts of scholars; to absorb other Old Testament passages whose import has been shown to be far below the standards of Christian morality and insight; and to delight in the morbid and idolatrous cult of the magico-miraculous which has kept many who believe in it, and many who are nauseated by it, from the true good news of Christ and the moral and spiritual miracles which it can work in men's lives.

Again, we have a Prayer-book whose treasures are marred by a few passages which jar upon the conscience of honest worshippers. Some of these passages presuppose those few traditional beliefs which have not survived the criticisms of scholarly research; others, especially some of the Old Testament psalms and canticles, are nearly as sub-Christian as the *Book of Joshua* unless mystically and allegorically re-interpreted in a manner known only to a few experts. The word 'liturgy' means 'public service,' not the secret formulae of an esoteric clique. We need new forms of service which not only embody the established conclusions of modern scholarship, but which are relevant to the life of the factories and suburban dwellings which constitute (however much some of us may dislike them) the modern world.[4]

The result of this lack of a liturgy expressing the conclusions of reliable Christian scholars in language that may be 'understanded of the people,' has been that congregations have been forced to choose between the new scholarship and the old liturgy. And inevitably many, both young and old, are choosing the latter. For their great need is for a vehicle for religious expression, a means of hearing the concrete word of God, and not for mere scholarship. That is surely one important reason why there has been a reaction lately against even some of the more cautious and assured conclusions of modern scholarship. They are too much like an 'unearthly ballet of bloodless categories': what the plain man needs is concrete forms of worship, *i.e.* of '*worthship*,' which make real to him the presence and worth of his Creator. And if they cannot have a really good liturgy, expressive of the truest revelations of God, many will prefer an indifferent one, especially if couched in the magnificent language of 1662, rather than have none at all.

[4] *cf.* the Malvern Conference Report, pp. 12-13: 'At the heart of all the life and witness of the Church is its worship. This must be so directed and conducted that its relevance to life and to men's actual needs is evident. For this purpose *our traditional forms of Matins and Evensong, presupposing as they do acceptance of the tradition of the Church and unfailing regularity of use, are largely unsuitable.* They must in most places be supplemented by services of another type, whether liturgical or not, designed to bring before uninstructed people the truth concerning God as Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, His claim upon our lives, our need of His grace and our hope in His love and power.'

Many others, alas, will have neither the dry bones of the new scholarship nor the somewhat stale flesh and blood of the old liturgy. And the Church becomes more and more out of touch with the community at large.

But the present war has given us what may prove to be a last chance to bring about the resurrection and re-integration of Christianity in Europe. When so much is in the melting-pot, we have an opportunity to remould, which may not come again. No doubt much of the detailed constructive work must wait until after the war: but some of us, if only by shedding a few of our prejudices, and trying to see the religious needs of the community as a whole, must prepare for it now.

I do not myself think that very large changes are needed in our Prayer-book. But some of the occasional offices and parts of Matins and Evensong that are more Jewish than Christian will surely have to be revised if Christianity is to count for much in the unknown new life that awaits us after the war. There are some things in our present Church life which must die if the whole is to live again.

* * * *

Meanwhile, the war has got to be won. That is going to involve Herculean labours and self-sacrifice from which many a saint might shrink. But we are ourselves amazed at the fortitude which our armed forces and civil defence services have shown. They too have found in the common purpose a new sense of vocation which has, in spite of all, enriched their lives and taken them out of their petty egoisms. The whole process has been a striking instance of *external* constraint actually promoting the growth of that internal liberty which many a lotus-eater had lost. And now the democracies which survive are no longer touched by the taunt (however much Lord 'Haw-Haw' may continue to repeat it) that they are wanting in that internal liberty, that very self-mastery upon which they wholly depend. And it is no accident that the democracies which survive are all (unless we count Turkey) countries in which a positive Biblical Christianity — untrammelled by the extreme time-serving that is paradoxically more conspicuous in the international organization of the Roman Church than in the National Churches influenced by the Reformation — has been a potent influence in their national life.

And just as the harmonious spreading of the true Gospel seems to depend upon the victory of the Allies in this war, so also the winning of that victory will depend enormously upon the Christian heritage which has hitherto helped to keep those democracies alive. For both reasons, therefore, it is imperative that the Church should put forth her maximum efforts in the next few years: if the Government cannot see its way to define more closely even the principles for which it fights, it is the more incumbent upon Christians to define *their* peace-aims. So may they contribute to victory over the forces of tyranny in this world, victory over the slavery which is in ourselves, and victory in that yet mightier struggle against the cosmic forces of evil, a victory whose final fruits can only be tasted beyond the grave. And it may be that the experiences and experiments of the dug-out and the battleship, of the aerodrome and the air-raid shelter, will give us the revised and relevant forms of worship, of truth embodied in a living liturgy, a genuinely 'public service' of God Himself, which we need, to make, and to keep, us truly free.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIANITY AND SPIRITUALISM

The Master of the Temple has written a book* which is, in the main, a plea that the Christian should give sympathetic consideration to the claim that Spiritualism proves the survival of human personality beyond death. He himself considers that the facts disclosed by psychical research 'make survival an assured truth.' If he be right, Spiritualism is clearly relevant to any religion which stresses belief in the life of the world to come. Canon Anson urges that it is specially relevant to Christianity, because historically the Christian faith is based on post-mortem manifestations of the risen Jesus analogous to modern spiritualistic phenomena. The evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus is not, from a strictly critical point of view, overwhelming. It is not contemporary; it is conflicting; it has clearly been developed and embroidered. If it were examined by the standards applied to modern reports of supra-normal happenings it would not receive acceptance. If however it were fortified by sound evidence for contemporary phenomena of an analogous character, many who, perhaps unwillingly, now reject it, would find it adequate.

'Christianity,' writes Canon Anson, 'began with a definite, psychi-

* *The Truth about Spiritualism.* By Harold Anson. Published in 1941 by the S.C.M. Press. Price 2*s*.

cal, transcendental "miracle," with an appearance of the dead, buried, but risen Christ, a body materialized and dematerialized at will, visible to the eye, audible to the ear, tangible to the hands, a portent more startling and challenging than any recorded by psychical research in our own day.'

The modern student may well demur at this lumping together of the various traditions of the Resurrection manifestations. With the Rev. P. Gardner-Smith, he will make allowance for 'the growth of tradition stimulated by pious imagination and dogmatic conviction.' But, putting this aside, there is a significant difference between the evidence for the Resurrection appearances and much of the evidence adduced for the alleged happenings in the séance room. However frankly the honest critic may admit the part played by legendary development in the Gospel accounts of the Resurrection manifestations, he will not ascribe them to trickery and fraud. That trickery and fraud have played a part in the story of modern Spiritualism is a patent fact, a fact which Canon Anson freely admits. Some mediums, he says, are definitely fraudulent, while others, perhaps half unconsciously, have drifted into fraud as their psychic powers have waned.

While Canon Anson holds that Spiritualism proves that there is a life beyond death, he sets no high value on the information about it which reaches us through the agency of mediums. Most of it, he says, is 'terribly poor stuff,' though perhaps he would not go as far as Professor A. E. Taylor in hoping that, if even the most harmless 'messages from beyond the tomb' are authentic, the unseen world has its homes for the feeble-minded. An alleged message from the late 'Dick' Sheppard runs: 'To all people who on earth do dwell—I send greetings. May you all learn, and realize, the Truth. I have been appointed to a position of authority and *trust*. I am responsible to God and to His beloved Son Jesus Christ, whom I hope to serve all the days of my life. I could not seek any greater honour. For the peoples of the earth I have a wonderful message, . . . there is *no* death!' Canon Anson is quite sure that all who knew Canon Sheppard will regard this pitiable effusion with disgust and would, if they regarded it as a genuine message, be horrified at the *post mortem* deterioration of mind and spirit which it indicated.

He suggests that the poor quality of the messages may be due to difficulties of communication. The discarnate spirit has to convey his message through another spirit, the 'control,' who often has 'the mentality of a young kitchen-maid.' Then this 'control' has to impress the message on the brain substance and vocal organs of the medium, who, in turn, has to convey it to the sitter. On these assumptions a considerable distortion of the message may be inevitable. Though the sitter may have reason to believe that he has genuinely received a message, in the form in which it reaches him it may be very unsatisfying.

Though Canon Anson insists strongly that Spiritualism provides cogent

evidence for survival, and though he deplores the levity of those who would dismiss it without examination, he deprecates the claim of Spiritualism to provide an adequate religion.

> 'Spiritualism, considered as a religion, rests upon a misconception that messages given through mediums from the next stage of living are more likely to give us a true approach to God than messages given by men living in the flesh, and using their minds as a vehicle of divine truth.'

G. L. H. HARVEY.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN BASIC ENGLISH*

For this version of the New Testament in basic English, the vocabulary available was increased from 850 to 1,000 words. Fifty of the additional words were biblical and a hundred poetical. Dr. S. H. Hook directed the new translation from the Greek on which the Testament is based.

In reviewing a work of this nature, it would be foolish to do more than to state what its purpose is and to suggest whether or not it is achieved.

The purpose of the book is made clear by the publishers. It is, first of all, 'intended to bring the English Bible, in a form they can understand, to the many potential new readers all over the world who know only a little English, and to provide a simple translation for those for whom the rich Elizabethan prose of the Authorised Version conceals, sometimes by its very familiarity, the plain meaning of the text.'

It would be hard to deny the clarity of this Testament, or the arresting unfamiliarity of the diction:

> 'From the first the Word was in being, and the Word was with God and the Word was God.
>
> 2. He was with God from the first.
>
> 3. All things came into being through him; and nothing which has existence came into being without him.
>
> 4. In him was life, and that life was the light of men.
>
> 5. And the light goes on shining in the dark, and is not overcome by the dark.
>
> 6. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.
>
> 7. He came for witness, to give witness about the light, so that all men might have faith through him.
>
> 8. He himself was not the light; he was sent to give witness about the light.
>
> 9. The True Light, which gives light to every man, was then coming into the world.
>
> 10. He was in the world, the world which came into being through him, but the world had no knowledge of him.
>
> 11. He came to the things that were his, and his people did not take him to their hearts.

* *The New Testament in Basic English.* Edited by Dr. S. H. Hook. (Cambridge University Press. 1941. Pocket Edition: In cloth, 3/- net; in leather cloth, 3/6 net. Larger Edition (set in paragraphs): In cloth, 8/6 net.)

12. To all those who did so take him, however, he gave the right of becoming children of God — that is, to those who had faith in his name.

13. Whose birth was from God and not from blood or from an impulse of the flesh and man's desire.

14. And so the Word became flesh and took a place among us for a time; and we saw his glory—such glory as is given an only son by his father—saw it to be true and full of grace.'

This simple, clear style also makes apparent the meaning of that difficult passage, *Romans* i, 18 to 29, where Paul apologises for God's 'punishment' of heathen peoples by suggesting that they were once offered ethical monotheism, but deliberately rejected it.

'18. For there is a revelation of the wrath of God from heaven against all the wrongdoing and evil thoughts of men who keep down what is true by wrongdoing.

19. Because the knowledge of God may be seen in them, God having made it clear to them.

20. For from the first making of the world, those things of God which the eye is unable to see, that is, his external power and existence, are fully made clear, he having given the knowledge of them through the things which he has made, so that men have no reason for wrongdoing.

21. Because, having knowledge of God they did not give glory to God as God, and did not give praise, but their minds were full of foolish things, and their hearts, being without sense, were made dark.

22. Seeming to be wise, they were in fact foolish.

23. And by them the glory of the eternal God was changed and made into the image of man who is not eternal, and birds and beasts and things which go on the earth.

24. For this reason God gave them up to the evil desires of their hearts, working shame in their bodies with one another.'

There are occasions when the limited vocabulary prevents the most apt word from being used. *Romans* v, 1, is rendered 'For which reason, because we have righteousness through faith let us be at peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.'

'Δικαιωθέντες' implies rather 'we are accounted righteous (though we are not so)' — almost 'acquitted.' But the value of the work is obvious if these verses (*Rom.* v, 7-8) are contrasted with the A.V.:

'7. Now it is hard for anyone to give his life even for an upright man, though it might be that for a good man someone would give his life.

8. But God has made clear his love to us, in that, when we were still sinners, Christ gave his life for us.'

We may note, however, that the Greek work *Agathos* ought here to have been translated 'kind,' not 'good.' St. Paul is maintaining that the

just man will get his due — no more: but the kind man may possibly secure more.

Sometimes basic English compels irritating circumlocution. There is an example in the Preface to this work. 'The work of putting the Bible into other languages' and 'it was gone over in detail' could have saved six words by use of 'translate' and 'revise'; while the rendering of the disciples' cry, 'Master, destruction is near,' has an unreality of its own. But such criticism is really invalidated by the publishers' assertion that 'basic English is not intended to replace English.' The limited vocabulary makes occasional awkwardness inevitable, and it is amazing how rare such examples are.

The publishers also admit that Homer in basic would lose a good deal of the 'surge and thunder of the Odyssey.' But there is every justification for their claim that these simple words have a music of their own, and that the familiar cadences of the A.V. have been retained where possible. *I Cor.* xiii begins:

> 'If I make use of the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am like sounding brass or a loud tongued bell.
>
> 2. And if I have a prophet's power, and have knowledge of all secret things; and if I have all faith, by which mountains may be moved from their place, but have not love, I am nothing.'

Far more frequent than the gaucheries are the passages where basic is ideally suited to the simple, direct words which our Lord surely used. We have 'take an example from the fig tree' for 'now learn a parable,' and an excellent rendering of *Mk.* v (22-41), where the vivid clarity of the narrative culminates in Jesus' words, 'My child, get up.' The point that Jesus avoided startling the child, by using her mother's familiar morning call, is lost to modern readers in 'Damsel, I say unto thee, arise.'

As the publishers claim, this version of the N.T. will be invaluable to Sunday School teachers and to foreigners with small English vocabularies. It will also show new meanings to readers familiar with the A.V. and liable to lose the meaning in the poetry.

It is not, and it makes no claim to be, a book to give the original force and beauty of the Good News to the modern English reader. It is still true of translators that 'there is no man speaketh as we speak in the street.' But all that this work sets out to do, it does triumphantly achieve.

N.S.P.

THE EXCAVATIONS AT LACHISH*

Excavation of the mound of Tell-ed-Duweir (almost certainly to be identified with the ancient Lachish) was begun in 1932 by a joint British and American expedition under the leadership of Mr. J. L. Starkey. During the

* *Lachish II: The Fosse Temple*, by Olga Tufnell, Charles H. Inge and Lankester Harding. (Oxford University Press. 1940. pp. 104+73 plates. 25/-.)

five subsequent seasons the work was financed entirely by the British Wellcome-Marston Archaeological Research Expedition to the Near East, but Mr. Starkey remained in charge throughout until his tragic death at the hands of Arab brigands on January 10th, 1938. Mr. C. H. Inge then assumed control and presented the report for the season 1937-38; but in view of the disturbed political condition of the country it was decided, at any rate temporarily, to suspend operations. The outbreak of war has naturally rendered any resumption impossible.

The Expedition is accordingly at present engaged upon the task of co-ordinating, describing and publishing the results obtained in the field. *Lachish I: The Lachish Letters* appeared in 1938, and contained a complete set of photographs of these already famous ink-inscribed potsherds, together with a provisional text and translation, an introduction and elaborate notes. Now *Lachish II* deals with the small temple discovered outside the city walls. First erected about 1500 B.C. and afterwards twice rebuilt, the temple continued in constant use until it was destroyed by fire at the beginning of the twelfth century. Of the identity of the deity, or deities, there worshipped we are unfortunately unaware, all traces having vanished; but much of the cult-apparatus has remained *in situ* since the final conflagration. The usual paraphernalia of sacrificial ritual are well exemplified; an altar with three steps leading up to it is reminiscent of the prohibition of steps to an Israelite altar in *Exod.* xx, 26; while the so-called 'Lachish Ewer,' though its inscription is of doubtful interpretation, decisively proves the use of an alphabetic script in Palestine at the latest by the year 1200.

In *The Fosse Temple* all these objects, as well as the temple's structural details, have been severally treated and illustrated with a meticulous care and precision. The book thus presents us with a quantity of most valuable additional material for our understanding of Canaanite religion and culture at the time of the Hebrew invasion.

H.F.D.S.

WHY PRACTISE DIVINE WORSHIP?*

This is a sound book, scholarly and simple. And it moves on the plane of religion, where divergent systems of belief and practice find an underlying unity and in whose atmosphere truth can be spoken in love. The book is addressed both to those who neglect and to those who join in public worship.

> 'It invites the former to consider again the rightful and needful place of worship in life,' so that we lose not 'that fundamental humility of spirit which is part of sanity.' . . . 'It invites the latter to reconsider both the meaning and manner of worship,'

that our worship may be made more worthy.

* *Worship.* By J. O. Dobson. (Student Christian Movement Press, January, 1941. 5/-.)

We are given glimpses of religion in its beginnings and of the profounder communings of the great souls of history.

> 'Nor is the experience merely a pre-scientific feeling-cult. To this generation has been given a large and expanding knowledge of the Universe. . . . Life, in the working together of its myriad forms, appears like great drama, or epic or symphony, possessing inner unity, coherence and purpose. . . . Creation is no longer seen as a series of arbitrary acts. . . . From such a view of natural life, it is but a step to seeing it as a vast company of creatures, whose various life is an offering of praise to its Creator, even as a choir in whose worship the human spirit can join.'

The section on Christian worship, after explaining its notes of invocation and adoration, penitence and confession, thanksgiving and self-offering, petition and intercession, proceeds to explain its use of symbols, and the dangers and advantages of formalism are also dealt with.

> 'Every symbol originates in a context, from which its meaning derives, and if this be forgotten it may lose its value. On the other hand, experience may discover new meanings or shades of meaning in a symbol. The Church must constantly ask itself, What mean ye by this thing?'

Patterns of worship are traced to their origins and there is illuminating treatment of their development in the Greek, Roman, Anglican and other Liturgies. The worship of Quakers obtains here an understanding unusual in a sacramentalist. Quakers are usually dismissed as illogical in that their very silence is a symbol. Mr. Dobson, however, recognizes that their whole view of life is *acknowledged* to be sacramental, for which reason men like William Penn believed that 'the less Form in religion the better, since God is Spirit' and indwells all things.

> 'Some also felt it a difficulty that corporate acts of praise and prayer may express more (or less) than is true for an individual worshipper.'

'Art in Worship' is the title of another chapter; and in addition to giving a sketch of its history, the author points out that even those who sought to escape the use of it did not do so.

> 'The saintly Bernard might fear the appeal of scenic beauty, but *Jesus, dulcis memoria* (*sic*) is poetry. Austere Protestants, with an outlook of Hebraic severity and with no aesthetic intention, have written imperishable prose or poetry — witness Luther's *Ein feste burg* . . . or John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*.'

Naturally the book contains a section on Church music, ancient and modern.

In a chapter on 'The Future of Worship,' while the teaching office of the Church is invoked for purposes of explaining traditional forms to modern ears, the question of revising both the language and forms of public

prayer is not shirked. The author's remark is interesting, that, however illogical the fact may be,

> 'the cleavages between the Established and Non-conforming Churches has, for the average man, come to consist chiefly in the difference of mode of worship. But (this difference) . . . is rather a reason for their reunion. During four centuries of dividedness, various bodies of reformed Christians have worked out the intrinsic values in varied modes of worship, each of which has nourished piety and Christian living, and that experience is a large part of the gift each might bring to enrich a reunited Church.'

Mr. Dobson also takes note of the hymn writers and liturgiologists of the Christian communities in Asia, and gives examples of their work.

Of sermons as part of public worship, he says, among other true things, that

> 'the great vital and creative periods of the Church, whether of its expansion in non-Christian lands or the revival of religion amongst people traditionally Christian, have always been periods of inspired and effective preaching.'

The fulfilment of worship in life is a theme which also receives attention, and we may well hope that this balanced and timely book will fulfil its author's hope and encourage the understanding and practice of true Christian worship.

R. D. RICHARDSON.

PIONEERS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION*

God is either everywhere or nowhere, and therefore, unless we are thorough-going atheists, we cannot recognise such an anomaly as secular education. The attempts to produce in our country an educational system from which God is absent has indeed been made with results that could have been foreseen — and were in fact foreseen — by intelligent observers thirty years ago. People are now beginning to be somewhat alarmed at what they have done — or allowed others to do in their names — and one result of this alarm is that Religious Education (with capitals now) is front page news. Books are being written on the subject, and this is all to the good, for if we are to end the present lamentable sloth of affairs we shall need all the knowledge that the experts can give us.

For these reasons, the book under review deserves a warm welcome. Within the limits set by himself, Mr. Kinlock has rendered a valuable contribution to the common cause, and it is much to be hoped that *Pioneers of Religious Education* will be widely read by parents and schoolmasters. To prevent disappointment, however, the reader must accept the limitations which are most carefully explained by the author in the opening chapter. This is not a treatise on method, and neither is it a complete history even of

* *Pioneers of Religious Education*, by T. F. Kinloch. (Oxford University Press. 3/6. 1939.)

the pioneers of method. Just as *The Acts of the Apostles* might more fittingly be called *Some of the Acts of some of the Apostles,* so this book only professes to be the story of some of the acts of some of the pioneers.

The author begins with the Renaissance, and by that he means Petrarch and the fourteenth century. Some, of course, would date the revival of learning a good deal earlier: actually the first 'pioneer' who finds a place in Mr. Kinlock's book is Erasmus, closely followed by Colet, so we actually begin with the sixteenth century. But, though leaders are mentioned, these earlier chapters really deal with movements rather than with individuals—and quite good chapters they are. Then come really admirable short accounts of Comenius, Francke, Zinzendorf, Pestalozzi and Schleiermacher. Lastly, we make a welcome return to this country with a sympathetic account of Thomas Arnold's work. The last chapter deals with some of the problems presented by the modern Day School. One statement in it deserves wide publicity:

> 'No school which has a good opening service can fail to teach religion . . . The spirit of the school . . . makes lessons, games, the work of prefects, respect for masters, develop all unconsciously those spiritual muscles without which religion cannot live.'

This is well said and all good schoolmasters will welcome it. But the preceding page with such statements as 'Christian ethics cannot be divorced from the Person of Christ' and 'Belief in Christ as Redeemer-King is the very essence of the Christian faith' will only cause confusion. They should either be omitted or expounded at far greater length.

Lastly, at the risk of incurring a charge of pedantry, we must utter a mild protest against the increasingly frequent use of the word 'obtain' as an intransitive verb.

R. B. Henderson.

SOME ASPECTS OF CONTEMPORARY RELIGION*

In 1931-32 a commission was sent from America to study certain American Protestant missions in Asia. In 1932 they published their opinions in a book called *Rethinking Missions.* The result of that book was to dry up a great deal of the financial support of American Missions without turning the zeal of the donors for the religious uplift of Asia into any other or better channels. Professor Hocking was the Chairman of that Commission. Now he returns to the attack with a book called *Living Religions and a World Faith.* There are some true things said in the book—such, for instance, as criticism of the superficial training of some of our missionaries. But such occasional truths must not beguile the reader into accepting either

* *Living Religions and a World Faith,* by W. E. Hocking. (Allen & Unwin. 1940. 10/-.)
The Doctrines of Modern Judaism Considered, by A. Lukyn Williams. (S.P.C.K. 1939. 5/-.)
Editor's Quest: A Memoir of Frederic Cook Morehouse, by W. Bertrand Stevens. (Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York. 1940. $2.50.)

the other statements or the views of the author. He fails to see the distinction between Christianity and other religions through pure ignorance of the facts. He shows no competent knowledge of the history and literature of any one non-Christian religion; he shows no competent knowledge of the actual present beliefs and practices of any one non-Christian religion; nor, except as a passing visitor, has he lived in the lands where these religions are at home. He has no adequate knowledge of the strength and vitality of the Christian movement in Asia, nor the extent to which it is carried on and is expanding without Western personnel. His criticism of missionary methods comes very ill from one who does not know of the efforts of many missionaries to conserve all that is best in other religions. The best of our missionaries are working along lines which will lead towards the deeper understanding of Christ and the extension of His kingdom throughout the world. Compared with these sound lines of advance, the proposals made by Prof. Hocking are not worth consideration, because they are not based on knowledge of the facts of the situation.

The next book on the list, *The Doctrines of Modern Judaism Considered*, by A. Lukyn Williams, well illustrates by contrast the above scathing remarks. The simple fact, to which Dr. Lukyn Williams alludes, that Christianity and Judaism are the only religions which believe in both the unity and the holiness of God, is sufficient to dispose of Prof. Hocking's ideas of how a universal religion could be arrived at; for these two facts about God are so vital to religion that Jew and Christian alike would die to preserve them. Dr. Williams gives a very good sample of the method of approach to another religion. He has real sympathy with the Jews; he knows them and their thoughts; he draws attention to the good points in their religion, and also, because he is their friend, to the bad points and the errors; nor is he afraid to say that he looks forward to the future when all Jews, and not merely some as at present, will be within the Christian fold. It is a small book, which can only deal with certain important points; and it is not easy to give the varying Jewish views, or the still more varying Christian ones. Intended mainly for Christian readers, it gives a clear introduction to the religious ideas of the modern Jew. The author evidently has an occasional Jewish reader in mind, and does his best, in the small space available, to give the Christian ideas corresponding to the quoted Jewish ones. In doing this it was unavoidable to give the preference to Christian views of one particular type. But some space might have been saved by the omission of a few peculiar views such as an unusual theory about the origin of the Jewish belief in the future life, and a polemic against the use of the English word 'priests' for Christian ministers. The book has one of the great virtues of an introduction in that by numerous quotations and references it provides guidance for Christian readers who wish to pursue further their studies of modern Judaism.

It is difficult for anyone who has only at rare intervals seen a copy of *The Living Church* to do justice to the life of F. C. Morehouse, for over thirty years its editor. *Editor's Quest* is clearly written by the Bishop of Los Angeles, and gives a picture of a kindly man, much beloved even by opponents, of considerable literary gifts, a keen controversialist, whose interests generally (to judge solely by this book) seem to have lain in things of secondary importance. It may be that the author of the biography has not made the selection we should have made of Mr. Morehouse's writings, or on the other hand it may be that it was characteristic of the man that the only missionary topic dealt with at length was a controversy over a particular American missionary who had adopted Roman practices. His treatment of that particular controversy was both wise and Christian; but were there no other or weightier missionary problems discussed in *The Living Church* in thirty years?

L. E. Browne.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL FOR SCHOOL USE*

As the Bishop of Liverpool points out in his foreword to Mr. R. F. Bailey's School Commentary, this, *The Gospel of St. John,* the fourth gospel, is of vital importance to those who wish to understand the life and teaching of Jesus. Mr. Bailey, who, as a schoolmaster, knows the difficulties of teaching this book, has put together here the fruits of his teaching his own VIth Form. There is no doubt that school divinity syllabuses tend to fight shy of the difficulties of this gospel, and it certainly cannot be taught by anyone who is unwilling to give considerable preparation to his lessons. This book will give a good deal of help to anyone who is both ready and willing to do this.

Mr. Bailey makes his attitude to the authorship clear in an early note; the author, if not the Apostle John, reports the evidence of a disciple of Jesus with sufficient accuracy. There is also an appendix in which are summarised the different possibilities and theories about the authorship. Mr. Bailey does not commit himself to a personal opinion about them. He does the same with the Resurrection narrative. He gives an analysis of certain definite facts which emerge from the story as told by all four gospels, and leaves it at that. It is a method which all teachers must frequently adopt, and it is not, as some might think, just evasiveness and an anxiety to please all parties; it is often the only fair way of teaching. The teacher, having given the evidence, is not precluded from stating his private opinion. But he has no right to ram this opinion down his pupils' throats, or din it into their ears, as if it were fact. It is his business to teach them to think for themselves, as well as to teach the fourth gospel; and he will fail in the latter object if he fails in the former.

* *The Gospel of St. John.* An Introductory Commentary, by R. F. Bailey, Headmaster of Quarry Bank High School, Liverpool. (Student Christian Movement Press. 5/-. 1940.)

I doubt whether the first fourteen verses of the gospel have been made intelligible even to an exceptionally alert sixth-former. I hasten to add that I doubt whether anyone else could make them more intelligible than Mr. Bailey has in fact done. The passage needs an adult brain and a capacity to deal with abstractions rarely possessed under the age of twenty-five.

The method of Mr. Bailey's commentary is a good one; it takes the form chiefly of a running analysis, with incidental explanation of minor points (geography and so on) in the text. He has added a few footnotes. The precise distinction as to what is to go into the text and what into the footnotes is not clear; as it is, the presence of the footnotes is something of an interruption in a singularly smooth-flowing and easily-read commentary.

In addition to the appendix on authorship mentioned above, there is also one on the 'woman taken in adultery' passage, a brief subject-index which will be useful to teachers, and a summary of the gospel's contents which will be welcomed by those about to take an examination on the book.

This book is essentially the work of a practical teacher who knows the difficulties of his pupils and the sort of questions they ask. He would disclaim originality; he knows how to make wise use of authorities; his interpretation of those authorities is full of the felicity which comes from such study as the repeated delivery of a course of lessons or lectures can allow.

W. H. OLDAKER.

DR. TEMPLE ON CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP*

It is indeed a sign of the times that a work of this character should be published as the 'Lent Book' for an arch-diocese; whether a sign of good or evil, or a very dubious mixture of both, opinions will differ.

Dr. Temple begins by pointing out that 'political thought, from the sixteenth century onwards, has followed the lines traced out at the Renaissance.' 'Macchiavelli is a true idealist, but an unprincipled idealist.' 'The distinctive enterprise of the Middle Ages was the effort of the Church . . . to control the State.' 'It was,' he rather oddly asserts, 'in principle a laudable enterprise'; and he adds that 'the victory of the Papacy . . . may be regarded as more advantageous to Christendom than its defeat would have been.' No doubt 'every new assertion of God's authority over His world is sheer gain'; but an assertion of the *Church's* authority over the secular arm is a totally different matter, *even when the Church happens to be right* on the particular point at issue. The Archbishop, it is true, shows himself later on to be at bottom a good Ghibelline; but it is regrettable that he, once or twice, gives so uncertain a sound, and that he did not roundly denounce the Hildebrandine or Guelfic policy as, essentially and *ab initio,* a complete fall of the Church before the Temptation on the Mountain.

* *Citizen and Churchman,* by William Temple, Archbishop of York. (Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1941. 3/6.)

On the limitations of State-loyalty Dr. Temple is excellent. 'Absolute allegiance . . . is due to God alone; and He is the Father of all men.' Further, the idea 'of the State as Power' must be repudiated; it is 'essentially the sower and upholder of Law.' 'Its end is the welfare of the community. And the community consists of persons.'

A good point, excellently expressed, is 'that the spiritual function of the State is not to regulate religion but to make free scope for it.' 'Christianity is the most materialist of all the great religions' is far less happily phrased; but even here we know what Dr. Temple means. On the true nature, and the radical character, of sin he has some wise words. The cross-heading, 'The State stands for justice, the Church for love' neatly hits off another cardinal point. The whole of the latter, and more immediately practical, part of the book is written along the lines of a robust, and truly sanctified, common-sense. But indeed the whole work abounds in good things.

N. E. Egerton Swann.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

TWO WELCOME STATEMENTS

Sir,

May I comment on two statements in the April issue of the *Modern Churchman* which, I think, are as welcome as they are cogent and relevant to the present religious situation? The first occurs in the letter from Mr. Amphlett Micklewright and is in these admirably chosen words:

> 'The need of the present time is for the radical modernist who will go to the roots of the problems of religion and will not content himself with the restatement of a traditional formula in the language of to-day. Modernism must answer the question as to whether it is possible to accept the ideas of God, prayer, immortality in any accepted traditional sense. It must re-examine the place of Jesus in religion and decide anew whether the stereotyped picture is big enough to include the religious experiences of mankind.'

I interpret this passage as a plea for complete intellectual and religious honesty on the part of the M.C.U. I venture to make one practical suggestion upon it, *viz.* that when the next Modern Churchmen's Conference is held it shall follow the example of Parliament in war time and take the opportunity of going into a secret session upon the question which Mr. Micklewright has so courageously raised.

The second statement occurs in your editorial paragraph headed 'Practical Modernism and the M.C.U.,' and is in these words:

> 'We have reached a stage when our main concern is not ideals but methods, *i.e.* methods by which our ideals may be practically realized in our existing environment.'

I interpret this passage as a plea for definite practical action by the M.C.U. directed to implementing such of its aims as are most clearly applicable to

the present religious situation. For such action the time is surely ripe, for it must be plain to all of us that we are in the middle of a great revolutionary period in thought and action. If we do not seize the present opportunity we shall deserve the fate of those who hesitate and are lost. I suggest that the aims which are most clearly applicable to the present religious situation are those which seek to bring the terms of our liturgical forms of worship into harmony with modern knowledge and to promote Christian unity by fostering fellowship and co-operation in Word and Sacrament with other Christian societies. To implement these aims we need a Magna Carta of ordered liberty granting a legal right to the use of revised liturgies and to the practice of Christian fellowship by inter-change of pulpits and inter-communion.

If the members of our Union really desire to see such a charter of liberty conferred on the Church of England for the benefit of its liberal-minded members, then they will take the trouble to put pen to paper and make their desire very plain to the Council. It will then be for the Council to consider the best steps to take. I myself believe in bold, vigorous and, if necessary, drastic action. But I think the Council is entitled to be assured that, if it sets to work to devise a plan of action, it is leading a constituency which though small in numbers possesses great spirit and determination and really represents a much larger body of lay opinion both in Church and State.

H. F. WALKER.

Arnside, Westmorland.
4th May, 1941.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND ITS DIFFICULTIES.

SIR,

My experience as a Scripture specialist bears out Mr. Henderson's point about 'the indifference or hostility' of the staff to giving religious instruction; for the indifference and hostility are there and they are firmly entrenched.

The deeper reason for this is, I believe, not fear of trouble with Church leaders or parents, but the prevalent presumption among so many masters that religion is really an effete superstition, unworthy of modern civilization with its vast equipment of scientific knowledge. In short, it is the secularisation of modern thought that is the real stumbling-block to the cause of religion in secondary schools, and indeed everywhere else. There is so little conviction among university graduates that there is another world beyond the visible and temporal with which they have dealings. The establishment of such a belief in a world of spiritual reality is the primary need; for, if this were achieved, creeds and church and ritual would be seen to be merely aids and would cause no serious difficulty.

I am in the fortunate position of working in a school that takes religious instruction seriously and that allows me to teach the Bible in the light of modern knowledge. But I do not delude myself into thinking that Scripture lessons, even in these happy conditions, can do very much. As Canon Brayley and Mr. Henderson urge, an impressive morning assembly is a far more potent influence, and it is a great pity that so many schools take so little trouble over it.

H. B. CHAMPION.

69 Oakfield Road, N.14.
June 2nd, 1941.

WHEREWITHAL SHALL WE BE CLOTHED?

SIR,

In connection with the recent rationing of clothing, Canon 74 of 1603 deals with Ecclesiastical Decency in Apparel, but there is no general agreement at the present time on what is the correct garb for the clergy when not in church. Some would insist that the cassock should be worn; others are equally insistent that even the dog-collar should no longer be worn by the clergy and that anything that distinguishes them from laymen should be done away. There ought surely to be some general ruling on this question. The only ruling, apparently, is that contained in the Canon mentioned above, part of which I quote:

> 'We do further in like manner ordain that all the said Ecclesiastical Persons above mentioned shall usually wear in their journeys Cloaks with sleeves, commonly called Priests' Cloaks, without guards, welts long buttons or cuts. And no Ecclesiastical Person shall wear any Coif or wrought Night-cap, but only plain Night-caps of black silk, satin or velvet. In all which particulars concerning the apparel here prescribed, our meaning is not to attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments, but for decency, gravity, and order as is before specified. In private houses and in their studies, the said Persons Ecclesiastical may use any comely or scholar-like apparel, provided it be not cut or pinkt; and that in public they go not in their Doublet and Hose, without Coats or Cassocks; and that they wear not any light-coloured Stockings. Likewise poor benefice men and Curates (not being able to provide themselves long Gowns) may go in short Gowns of the fashion aforesaid.'

Now is the time, when clothing of all kinds is likely to become dear and scarce, for a decision to be made on what garb is essential to the office of a clergyman.

A. G. ENSOR.

Beckwell, Gretton Road,
Winchcombe, Glos.
June 2nd, 1941.

BIBLICAL STUDY FOR SCHOOLMASTERS AT OXFORD.

SIR,

Most people nowadays make the claim that they accept the results of Biblical scholarship. Unfortunately very few, excepting those who have gone through a theological course, have any very clear notion of the results of modern scholastic research. To meet the needs of those who would like to be better informed on these important matters, I have arranged to conduct a course in Bible Study at Oxford during the week beginning August 4th, 1941. The course is intended primarily for schoolmasters, but other men will be admitted if there is room. The cost will be £3 10s. inclusive. Those who can find accommodation for themselves will be admitted to the course for a registration fee of five shillings.

Anyone interested in this course should apply at once to me.

R. B. HENDERSON,
Manchester Reader in Religious Education.

New College, Oxford.
June 6th, 1941.